

REMARKS:

REGARDING DRAWING AMENDMENTS:

In the drawings, Figure 2 has been amended to show the circuit-breaker or switch aspect (component) of the detector 13 thereby addressing Examiner's rejection of claims 11 and 20 under § 112 by providing correspondence between the drawings and the specification and claims, as originally filed (See Merriam Webster's definition of "circuit breaker" and "switch" attached hereto). No new matter has been added.

REGARDING THE SPECIFICATION AND AMENDMENTS MADE THERETO:

Examiner has questioned the terminology "waist-controlled trucks (articulated haulers)." While the typical American term for the vehicle shown in Figure 1 is "articulated hauler," in Europe it is more often referred to as a "waist-controlled" vehicle or truck, especially when issues of language translation are considered. In fact, the mid-length located, articulating part of the vehicle is "waist-like" (just like that of a person) regarding the relative orientations of the vehicle that it accommodates (See Merriam Webster's definition of "waist" attached hereto). For this reason, the parallel reference of "articulated hauler" was included parenthetically in the original application thereby supplying the more Americanized counterpart-terminology.

Examiner's other objections to the Specification have been remedied.

REGARDING THE CLAIMS AND AMENDMENTS MADE THERETO:

Examiner's indication of allowability of claims 3-10, 13 and 16-19 is acknowledged with appreciation. Claims 3, 13 and 16 have been amended into independent format; care has been taken not to narrow the scope of those claims thereby avoiding any "Festo-type" limitations on the interpretation thereof. Those claims that depend either directly or indirectly from these allowable claims are similarly allowable.

Claims 11 and 20 have been amended to recite the "circuit breaker" by the alternative "switch" thereby utilizing more common terminology for the recited component. Together with

the corresponding amendments that have been made to the specification and drawings, Examiner's 35 USC § 112 rejections are remedied.

New claims 21-22 have been added. Claim 21 includes the limitation regarding the feature of the control arrangement being biased toward a configuration that locks the body of the truck against motion, and which Examiner has otherwise deemed allowable. Therefore, allowance of these three new claims is respectfully requested.

IN RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE ACTION:

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH:

Claims 11 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite and failing to particularly point out the Applicant's invention. In view of the amendments and comments provided hereinabove, Applicant submits that the rejections are obviated and requests that Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection of the claims and indicate their allowance in the next paper from the Office.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1, 2, 12, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oka et al. (US 4553734) in view of Tury (US 4922769). These claims have now been either cancelled or amended to depend from an allowable claims thereby rendering the rejection moot.


Serial No.: 10/065,825
Confirmation No.: 9651
Applicant: ELIASSON, Goran
Atty. Ref.: 00173.0020.PCUS00

The undersigned representative requests any extension of time that may be deemed necessary to further the prosecution of this application.

The undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-3038, referencing Order No. 00173.0020.PCUS00.

In order to facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, the Examiner should directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion.

Respectfully submitted,



Tracy W. Druce
Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 35,493
Tel. 202.383.7398 ,

Date: 11 Dec 03